system for line blanking in an interleaved system. The requirements for a progressive system are entirely different from the requirements for an interleaved system.

In his rejection of claim 1 the Examiner stated that the Zalm disclosed line-blanking system that can be viewed on a non-interleaved display device. At no place in the '456 reference did Zalm refer to a non-interleaved display device. Only an interlaced (interleaved) display device is mentioned (Column 4 lines 8-14).

In his rejection of claim 2, the Examiner quotes from Col. 3 line 66-68 and Col 4, line 1-5 that discusses the line-by line and field by field processing found when the sources are synchronized. As discussed on page 8 lines 21 – 30, the instant line blanker system provides a technique for identifying the first line of a video signal and eliminating any pseudo-stereoscopic flipping, the phenomenon in which right and left images are viewed by the wrong eyes, has been developed.

In his rejection of claim 3, the Examiner cites from the '456 reference at col. 4, lines 8-35. However, Zalm has no specific reference to the first line. This is more fully discussed at page 10, line 33 through page 11, line 12.

In his rejection of claims 4, 5 and 9, the Examiner quotes from circuits 6 and 7 of Figure 1 of the '456 reference. Circuits 6 and 7 of Figure 1 in the '456 reference do not detect the presence of a stereoscopic (3D) signal versus a 2D signal. On Page 10, lines 29-32, the Applicants discuss that it may be desirable to turn off the line blanking when 2-D images and text information are to be viewed on the display. One method of accomplishing is by encoding an on/off or enable/disable signal into the video. In a preferred embodiment, the same signal used to identify the first line of video can also be used to enable/disable the device.

In his rejection of Claim 6 the Examiner, in the opinion of the Applicants, totally misconstrues the use of color-coded signals. On pages 12 and 14, the Applicants clearly describe the use of color coded signals to enable the line-blanker system. This description includes the following: "Concerning implementation of the FLS signal or the enable/disable signals, it is possible to encode~ signals into the video data using several techniques. One way of encoding these signals is to encode a specific pattern of colors or images into the video data stream that can be detected by the line blanker system and are sufficiently unique that accidental signals do not occur in normal video images. The most straightforward method is to encode a color pattern at the start of a single video line. Preferably, specific color patterns of the primary colors are

used because they are easy to create and detect. Different color patterns can be used to signal different commands to the line blanker. A series of 256 patterns will fit into most video resolution formats and can be created to be sufficiently unique so as to not occur naturally in the video data stream. One possible implementation, for example, would be to convert the color pattern into its red, green, and blue components. The blue signal could be used as a clock signal to gate the red and green signals into two separate binary shift registers. If a predefined relationship between the two shift registers is achieved, an option in the line blanker is triggered. Another possible embodiment is to create distinct color patterns for each line blanker option." Zalm's '456 patent does describe any enabling system.

The Examiner rejected claim 10 for having a two inputs for receiving the line-blanking signal. While this claim is dependent upon an allowable claim and is therefore allowable, we believe the Examiner has misconstrued the claim as it stands. The claim as written discusses a line double signal to activate a line doubler as more fully described on page 15 of the specification.

The Examiner rejected claim 11 because delay unit 24 stores the selected line to place in the blanking line for viewing by the viewer. Again, unfortunately, the Examiner has misconstrued the role of the line doubler cited in claim 11. The line doubler as discussed on page 15 delays the video in order to repeat the video from one line into the blanked area in the next line. See Figure 5 and the description on pages 14 and 15.

The Examiner has rejected 12 through 21 for similar reasons as claim 1-11. The Applicants submit that the reasons to traverse claims 1-11 discussed above equally apply to claims 12-21.

Therefore, for the reason cited above, the Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of c laims 1-21. The Applicants' representative invites the Examiner to discuss the traverse of the rejections either by telephone or in a personal interview.

The Applicants' will be in the near future filing a Change of Power of Attorney from the firm of Fish and Neave to the undersigned and others. If a timely discussion is needed, please contact the undersigned.

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and an early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerow D. Brill
Registration No. 34,554
Reveo Inc.

Date: May 20, 2000
Address: 85 Executive Blvd.
Elmsford NY 10523
Telephone: (914) 345-9555
Facsimile (914) 345-9558
E-mail brillg@reveo.com